

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claim 14 has been amended to overcome the 35 USC 112 rejection, and not to overcome the prior art. Claim 16 has been newly added. No new matter has been presented.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully overcome in view of the foregoing claim amendment.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Haneda, U.S. Patent No. 6,011,575. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an input device for inputting distortion data of the exposure unit of an image forming device. The Examiner asserts that Haneda's registration sensing means corresponds to the claimed input device. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Haneda discloses a registration sensing means RS by which the registration pattern formed on the circumference of the photoreceptor drum 10 is sensed (col. 9, lines 18-21). The registration means RS is shown in Fig. 13. As described in Haneda, a registration pattern is formed on the circumference of the photoreceptor drum, which is then image-formed on image sensor RS1 (col. 9, lines 30-32). Element RS3 of Haneda is a light-emitting element which illuminates the registration pattern image from the interior (col. 9, lines 32-33). Haneda teaches that the registration pattern is stored in advance in ROM 252 (col. 9, lines 50-52). Applicants fails to see how the registration means of Haneda is an input device of any kind. Information is not input to the registration sensing means, rather the registration sensing means merely senses the registration pattern illuminates on the photoreceptor drum. Thus, Haneda fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

Claim 2 recites "wherein the exposure unit includes a plurality of the light emitting elements that are arranged in a line." Haneda fails to teach or suggest this feature.

As can be seen in Fig. 3 of Haneda, each LED of the exposure optical system 12 is housed inside the substrate inside the photoreceptor drum, and is not arranged in a line. As seen in Fig. 12, elements 12C, 12M, 12Y and 12K are all arranged near the outer circumference of the round photoreceptor drum and thus could not be arranged in a line. Thus, Haneda fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 2.

Claim 4 recites “wherein the input device is an operation panel operated by a user.” Applicants submit that Haneda fails to teach or suggest this feature.

The Examiner asserts that image information is input from outside the apparatus, citing col. 6, lines 21-24. However, claim 4 further defines the input device from claim 1, which is for inputting distortion data of the exposure unit. Even if Haneda teaches an input device for inputting image information, it does not teach an input device for inputting distortion data of the exposure unit. Further, the Examiner previously, in connection with claim 1, asserted that the registration means corresponds to the input device. Certainly the registration sensing means cannot be considered to correspond to an operational panel operated by a user. Thus, the features of claim 4 are not taught or suggested by Haneda.

Claim 5 recites “wherein the input device is equipped with plural kinds of input methods.” The Examiner asserts that the registration sensing means consists of image sensor RS1, image forming lens RS2 and LED RS3, which reads on the input device being equipped with plural kinds of input methods. Applicants respectfully disagree. The elements of Haneda which form the registration sensing means are not different input methods, and are not capable of inputting distortion data of the exposure unit. Thus, the features of claim 5 are not taught or suggested by Haneda.

Claim 6 recites “an input device for inputting distortion data of the exposure unit.” The Examiner asserts that the registration means corresponds to the claimed input device for inputting distortion data of the exposure unit. As stated above, Applicants submit that Haneda fails to teach

the claimed input device for inputting distortion data of the exposure unit. Thus, the features of claim 6 are not taught or suggested by Haneda.

Claim 7 is allowable for the same reasons claim 2 is allowable.

Claim 10 recites "a resist pattern forming device which forms resist patterns on the recording medium." Applicants submit that Haneda fails to teach or suggest this feature.

Haneda discloses that the registration sensing means forms a resist pattern on the photoreceptor drum 10, which is not a recording medium (col. 9, lines 20-21). Thus, Haneda fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 10.

The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies and further in view of the discussions above. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.


In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.

325772022400.

Dated: September 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7753